



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,089	02/28/2002	Scott P. Schreer	3247/NJJ	3357

26304 7590 12/20/2005

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP  
575 MADISON AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER

SALCE, JASON P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/086,089	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SCHREER, SCOTT P.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jason P. Salce	<b>Art Unit</b> 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/3/2005 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As discussed in the previous Interview dated 10/4/2005, in relation to the prior art of record, Applicant's representative argued that the receiving, feeding, storing and correlating steps were not performed by the user. The examiner noted that these

limitations were not present in the claims. Applicant's representative agreed to add these limitations to claims and file an RCE, for further consideration by the examiner.

The examiner has made previous 112 1<sup>st</sup> rejections based on the specification supporting certain claim limitations, and after further inspection of the specification, there is no discussion of the user member of the audience performing the receiving, feeding, storing and correlating steps. There is no suggestion where the processing steps discussed in the claim limitations are performed. At best, the specification notes a "monitoring station", which the examiner clearly meets with the current prior art rejection of record. A "monitoring station" provides no suggestion of where the steps are being performed in a generic client-server system, nor does an "end-user organization", which is also specified in the specification. In fact, the examiner would argue that an "end-user organization" would be a monitoring station at an intermediate/remote point, that monitors a plurality of end-users.

Therefore, the previous prior art rejection stands and the examiner will treat the limitation "by said user" as a user at a remote or intermediate point, as taught by the prior art rejection of record.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,193) in view of Wiser et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,596) in further view of Levine (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,100).

Referring to claim 1, Ginter discloses compensating at least one artist responsible for content of a digital audio recording file for the public performance of the content being included in a broadcast (see Column 3, Lines 20-24 and Column 4, Lines 8-18). Also note Column 260, Lines 11-15 for tracking "live performances", which is a public performance.

Ginter also discloses associating an identification code with the digital audio recording file to produce an identified digital audio recording file (see Column 130, Lines 7-11 for "embedded" content in a VDE object (see Column 58, Lines 43-46 and Lines 59-64 for further explanation of an object). Also note Column 7, Lines 51-52 for the VDE object containing a digital audio recording file.

Ginter also discloses generating an identification record correlating to the identification code and the digital audio recording file (see Column 153, Line 32 through Column 154, Line 49).

Ginter also discloses broadcasting the identified digital audio recording file as an encoded audio signal, in the public broadcast (see again Column 127, Lines 6-8 for "content delivery" over the media and Column 53, Lines 1-10 for broadcasting the information), wherein the public broadcast being made by one of a radio or television station broadcast (see Column 14, Lines 5-10), including cable and satellite networks and Internet websites (see Column 18, Lines 60-64).

Ginter also discloses that the public broadcast is remotely receivable simultaneously by a plurality of users constituting audience members of the public receiving the audio signal being publicly broadcast (see Column 127, Lines 45-49 for sending the VDE object to an electrical appliance). Also note above that television broadcasting networks can be used, which simultaneously transmit content to a plurality of audience members of a public broadcast.

Ginter also discloses feeding, storing and correlating (by said user member of the audience) the identification code and data related to the public broadcast and unrelated to the users constituting the audience members of the public and monitoring the broadcast (see Column 153, Lines 53-59 for storing registration information relating to the VDE data in a secure database 610) that stores and associates the identification code, and based on said identification code records and stores the identification code (see Column 153, Lines 62-64 for storing data from the VDE object 300) and transmission and broadcast related data in a batch file (see also saving shipping (transmission) and receiving (broadcast) data in tables (batch file) 444 and 446 in Figure 16), said broadcast related data including a date that the encoded audio signal was monitored, a time of day that the encoded audio signal was monitored (Column 155, Lines 22-23), and the duration of the monitored encoded audio signal (see Column 152, Lines 26-27 for a data length, which in the case of an audio file defines how long the song is). Also note that the system of Ginter discloses tracking VDE, which is the content that is broadcast, and there inherently teaches the limitation, "unrelated to the users constituting the audience members of the public".

Ginter teaches compensating a user for his/her work (see Column 3, Lines 20-24 and Column 4, Lines 8-18), but fails to disclose decoding and importing the batch file into a first database that catalogs performance, transmission and broadcast of the encoded audio signal and using the first database to accurately compensate the at least one performance artist responsible for generating content on said digital audio recording file.

Wiser discloses a logging module 1014, which catalogs performance, transmission and broadcast of the encoded audio signal (see Column 23, Lines 18-19 for logging each purchase of a media data file 200, which if purchased are transmitted/broadcasted (see Column 11, Lines 53-55). Wiser also discloses that these logs are used to accurately compensate the at least one performance artist responsible for generating content on said digital audio recording file (see Column 23, Lines 21-30 and Column 11, Lines 55-57 for reporting royalty payments). Therefore, Wiser discloses decoding and importing the batch file into a first database that catalogs public performance, based upon the incidence of the public broadcast and unrelated to the number of actual audience users and broadcast of the audio signal.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the VDE system, as taught by Ginter, using the payment and reporting tracking system, as taught by Wiser, for the purpose of allowing music industry participants to protect their copyrights and could be used by rights

Art Unit: 2614

reporting agencies to bill distributors for royalties associated with the volume of electronic distribution of the media data files (see Column 11, Lines 57-61 of Wiser).

Ginter and Wiser both fail to teach feeding a received and encoded audio signal into a cross phasing means that increases the accuracy of an encoded signal monitoring means.

Levine discloses a data robustness enhancer 1204 (which includes a convolutional encoder 1208), which shifts the watermark data to increase its accuracy for future detection (see Column 17, Lines 16-31). Therefore, Levine teaches creating and detecting a cross-phased audio signal.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the VDE system with data collection capability, as taught by Ginter and Haggard, using the cross-phasing means (convolutional encoder 1208), for the purpose of increasing the likelihood that the single bit can be retrieved from watermarked audio signal after significant processing is performed upon the watermarked audio signal (see Column 18, Lines 52-55 of Levine).

Claim 2 corresponds to claim 1, where Wiser discloses that the identification code embedded in the audio signal is a digital watermark (see Column 7, Lines 17-19).

Claim 3 corresponds to claim 1, where Ginter discloses embedding the identification code is performed by encoding software (see Column 6, Lines 45-55).



Claim 4 corresponds to claim 1, where Wiser discloses the identification code is in the form of a non-audible digital signal that is not rendered inoperable by one or more generations of analog taping and broadcast compressions (see the rejection of claim 2, which discloses the encoding of a watermark, which is not rendered inoperable by such analog deficiencies).

Claim 5 corresponds to claim 1, where Wiser discloses a second digital work library database to match the embedded identification code with the title of a digital audio work and its associated file information, and importing said title and associated file information from the second digital work library database to the first database (see element 120 in Figure 1 and Column 12, Lines 58-60 for a second database used to store the audio file and descriptive data (see Column 6, Lines 48-65).

Claim 6 corresponds to claim 5, where Wiser discloses using the embedded identification code to match the digital audio work's title to the recorded and stored transmission or broadcast related data (see Column 14, Lines 52-60 for searching database 120 if the audio file is not stored at content manager 112) and Ginter discloses printing a digital audio work usage report having both the title of the digital audio work and the transmission and broadcast related data (see Column 228, Lines 45-56).

Claim 7 corresponds to claim 1, where the examiner notes that multimedia includes both audio and video, therefore the digital audio recording file further comprises multimedia.

Referring to claims 9-11, see the rejection of claims 1 and 5-6 respectively.

---

---

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,193) in view of Wiser et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,596) in further view of Levine (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,100) in further view of BMI (What is a Cue Sheet?).

Referring to claim 8, Ginter, Wiser and Levine all teach the limitations of claim 1, but fail to disclose the use of a cue sheet.

BMI teaches using a cue sheet for keeping track of all the music used in films and on television shows (see Page 1, Third Paragraph for types of information in a cue sheet and Pages 2 and 3 for a sample cue sheet).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the information being tracked by Ginter, Wiser and Levine, using BMI's cue sheet, as taught by BMI, for the purpose of ensuring its writers and publishers receive the royalties due to them (see Page 1, First Paragraph of BMI).

### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason P. Salce whose telephone number is (571) 272-7301. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm.

Art Unit: 2614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason P Salce  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2614

December 14, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jason Salce", written in a cursive style.